Mao Tse-tung's

"DEMOCRACY"

a digest of the Bible of Chinese Communism

commentary by LIN YUTANG

with expurgated passages restored

This pamphlet contains a digest of the book *China's New Democracy* by Mao Tse-tung, Member of the Communist International, 1935-43; Party Boss of the Chinese Communists; Chairman of the Chinese Communist Central Executive Committee; Chairman of the Secretariat; Chairman of the Presidium of the Politburo; and Member of the Party Committee. It is based on the English translation published in America with an introduction by Earl Browder when he was General Secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A. In the present pamphlet the Browder edition is compared with the original Chinese text published in Yenan by the official Chinese Communist organ, the Emancipation Press (fifth edition, January, 1944), and the expurgated passages have been restored.

CHINESE NEWS SERVICE
An Agency of the Chinese Government

30 Rockefeller Plaza • New York 20, N. Y.

FOREWORD

THE all-important question today concerning future developments in China is: Are the Chinese Communists genuine Communists? Included in this big question are the following questions: Are they Marxists, Leninists and Stalinists? Does their program originate in Moscow and follow closely that of the Soviet Union? Are they irrevocably committed to alliance with the Soviet Russia? Are they unalterably opposed to the western democracies? Do they definitely repudiate democracy in our sense of the word? Do they aim to set up a dictatorship of the proletariat? Is their goal world proletariat revolution?

For the first time, the Chinese Communists have a chance to speak for themselves here through the mouth of their party boss and dictator, Mao Tse-tung. Here, in a book entitled *China's New Democracy,* Mao answers for us once and for all the question: Are the Chinese Communists genuine Communists? Furthermore, since the Chinese Communists say they are working for "democracy," how do they define "democracy"? Since they claim to be working also for the San Min Chu I of the Kuomintang, how do they define and interpret the San Min Chu I in their own sense?

The statements by Mao are important because they represent strictly the current orthodox line of thinking of the Chinese Communists today. The book was written in January, 1940, *after,* not before, the Chinese Communists had pledged themselves (in 1937) to renounce Communism and work for democracy. They are important because this book is the Bible of the Chinese Communists, just as anything said by Stalin is the Bible of the Russian Communists.

A digest of Mao's book is made for the following reasons. (1) Many readers are discouraged from reading the longer full text, and this digest enables them to glance through this all-important document in half an hour. (2) Mao's book lends itself to condensation conveniently; while many parts are repetitious and some of remote interest to the English readers, it follows a clear and well-connected outline. This digest is made so that the reader will obtain a complete and clearly set forth outline of his arguments. (3) This digest is made specifically for those who wish to seek an answer to the question: Are the Chinese Communists genuine Communists?

The deception being practised upon the public through the American edition, with an introduction by Earl Browder, former leader of American Communist Party, and issued with his blessing, has to be unmasked. The deliberate expurgations and misrenderings of the Chinese text fall into four categories. First, words, phrases and sentences tending to show that the Chinese Communists are anti-capitalist. The profusion of Mao's excoriations of capitalists makes so many restorations of the corrupted text necessary. Second, all passages affirming that the Chinese Communists intend to set up a "dictatorship of revolutionary classes," which is Mao's definition of the "New Democracy." Third, all passages showing that Mao is irrevocably set against the western democracies. Fourth, all passages affirming that Soviet Russia was "leading" and "assisting" other peoples to oppose the Second World War and overthrow capitalism during the Hitler-Stalin pact period, in which this book was written.

The un-Browderizing of the deceptive English edition is based on the Chinese fifth edition, 1944, published in Yenan by the Communist official press, *The Emancipation*. Italics in parentheses are Browder's version; lines in brackets are the restorations. Except for the restorations, the text is that of the Earl Browder edition. Readers who wish to compare the Browder version may buy it from the New Century Publishers, New York.

Too many Americans who rely on Communist interpreters in China are trying to speak for the Chinese Communists. Let us give the Chinese Communists a chance to speak for themselves.

The Chinese Communist program, with abrupt "tactical" changes following Moscow's lead once every two years from 1935 to 1943, may be summed up as follows. When in 1935 the Communist International in Moscow ordered the formation of the United Front in all countries, the Chinese Communists worked for the United Front in China, resulting in the February Agreement with the Kuomintang Government of 1937. From the outbreak of the war in 1937 down to 1939, when Stalin actively supported the Chinese Government in the war against Japan, the Chinese Communists actively supported the war and took orders from the National High Command. Immediately after the Stalin-Hitler pact was signed in the summer of 1939, the Chinese Communists, uniformly with Communists in all countries, took the extreme isolationist stand through repeated official declarations, slacked down in the war against the Axis, and concentrated on extensive fratricide warfare to "capture revolutionary leadership." In fact, during this period, it would have been extraordinary to find the

Chinese Red Army failing to follow Moscow's lead and fighting on what this book calls the "pro-imperialist front." From June, 1941, when Hitler attacked Russia, to the turning of the tide at Stalingrad, spring, 1943, the Chinese Communists, while not actively fighting Japan and still considering themselves independent, again supported the Chinese Government in the war against the Axis, even occasionally praising Chiang Kai-shek. The "Second Imperialist War," officially stigmatized as "a scramble for loot" by "mad dogs on both sides" had become a "war for freedom and democracy." After the turn of the battle at Stalingrad, when fear of Russia's defeat was averted and her position in the Far East was to be strengthened, intensive fratricidal warfare flared up again. From 1938 to the end of the war, for seven years, the Japanese front had always been within 100 miles of Yenan, which the Japanese singularly did not care to capture or destroy. Meanwhile, as the prospect for American supplies to China loomed up in 1943, the Chinese Communists, fearing the strengthening of Chungking, put up an intensive propaganda campaign to sabotage supplies for the Chinese Army and convince the Americans that they were "democrats" and entitled to backing by America.

Americans object to American Communists principally because they are not a political party but act as a fifth column owing allegiance first to a foreign country. Curiously enough, they think the Chinese people should not feel the same way regarding such a fifth column in their own country. This is possible only on the assumption, assiduously cultivated by fellow-travellers, that while the Communists in the United States, France, Yugoslavia, Poland, Iran, Korea and Outer Mongolia are one species of animals, the Chinese Communists are another. As a matter of fact, the international party line of the Communists in different countries is so solid and identical, in its sudden reversals from month to month, from year to year, that one could read the editorials of the Chinese Communist Party, the *Hsin Hwa Jih Pao*, published in Chungking, whether in 1939, 1941, or 1947, and imagine he was reading Frederick Field writing in the *New Masses*. The fact is, there are not different national Communist parties in dozens of countries, there is only one international Communist party in the world. There are not different party lines changing from time to time; there is only one Communist party line in whatever country and time, and that is, Russia is always right.

LIN YUTANG

New York City
April 1947

CHINA'S NEW DEMOCRACY

By Mao Tse-tung

I. Whither China?

. . . It may be worth while to utilize the opportunity of the publication of the *Chinese Culture* magazine to say a few words about the trend of Chinese politics and Chinese culture . . . many thorough-going articles have been written by our comrades in Yenan on the subject, so this rough sketch of mine may be looked upon as a mere prelude.

II. We Must Establish a New China

For the many past years, [we] Communists have struggled not only for the political and economic revolution in China, but also for the cultural revolution, all aiming at the construction of a new society and a new country for the Chinese people, in which not only a new system of politics and economy but also a new culture will prevail.

III. China's Historical Characteristics

Any given culture (*as a form of ideas*) [considered as that of an ideology] is the reflection of a given political and economic system of society, (*though*) [while] the former in turn exerts immense influence upon the latter; and politics is the concentrated expression of economy. This is our fundamental point of view toward the relationship of culture, politics and economy. Hence it is the given politics and economy that first determines the given culture, which only subsequently itself exerts influence upon the politics and economy. Marx said: It is not the ideology of the society that determines its existence, but the existence of the society that determines its ideology. . . . This is the first scientific explanation in the history of mankind, correctly to answer the question of the relation between ideology and existence, and that became the fundamental starting point of Lenin's (*motive*) [active], revolutionary theory of reflection which was developed from this Marxist point of view. In our discussion of China's cultural problems, this starting point should never be neglected.

It is quite clear then that the old culture [of the Chinese race] which we wish to sweep away cannot be isolated from the old politics and old economy of (*our*) [Chinese] nation, and the new [Chinese] culture which we aim to establish cannot be isolated from (*our*) [Chinese] new politics and new economy.

Italics in parentheses—Browder's version.
Passages in square brackets—passages expurgated or corrupted by Browder, now restored.

IV. China's Revolution is a Part of the World Revolution

The historical characteristic of the Chinese revolution is that it is divided into two steps, that of democracy and that of socialism. The democracy of the first step is not democracy in its general sense, but a new, special type of a Chinese style, the New Democracy. How then was this historical characteristic formed? . . .

A superficial study of the historical development of China and the world will reveal that such a historical characteristic did not exist in the days of the Opium War or in the period immediately following it, but took shape after the first imperialist world war and the Russian October Revolution.

This first step may be said to have begun from the days of the Opium War in 1840, i.e. from the time when the Chinese society commenced to change from its original feudal form to the semi-colonial and semi-feudal form. . . . This revolution, in its social character, was a bourgeois-democratic revolution and not a proletarian-socialist revolution.

A change took place in the Chinese bourgeois-democratic revolution after the outbreak of the first imperialist world war and the formation of the socialist state on one-sixth of the earth's surface through the success of the Russian October Revolution in 1917.

Before that, the Chinese bourgeois-democratic revolution belonged to the category of the old bourgeois-democratic revolution of the world and was a part of it.

Since then, the Chinese bourgeois-democratic revolution has changed its character and belongs to the category of the new bourgeois-democratic revolution. As far as the revolutionary front is concerned, it is a part of the world proletarian-socialist revolution.

Why? Because the first imperialist world war and the victorious socialist October Revolution changed the historical direction of the world, and drew a sharp dividing line between two historical stages.

At a time when world capitalism has collapsed in one part of the earth (a part occupying one-sixth of the earth's surface), while elsewhere it has clearly shown its symptoms of decadence; when the remaining part of the capitalist world cannot go on without relying more than ever on the colonies and semi-colonies, when the Socialist state has been established and declares its willingness to assist the struggle for the liberation movements of all the colonies and semi-colonies; and when the proletariats of the capitalist countries are being freed day by day from the influence of the imperialist social-democratic parties and also declare themselves will-

ing to assist the liberation movement of the colonies and semi-colonies; at a time like this, any revolution of the colonies and semi-colonies against imperialism, or international capitalism, can no longer belong to the category of the old bourgeois-democratic revolution of the world, but to a new category. It is no longer a part of the old bourgeois or capitalist world revolution but a part of the new world revolution—the proletarian-socialist revolution. . . .

. . . This kind of revolution is no longer the old type led solely by the (*bourgeois*) [capitalist] class and aiming merely at the establishment of a capitalist society (*or*) [and] a country under the dictatorship[1] of the (*bourgeois*) [capitalist] class, but a new type led wholly or partially by the proletariat and aiming at the establishment of a New-Democratic society (*or*) [and] a country (*ruled by the alliance*) [under the joint dictatorship][1] of several revolutionary classes in its first stage. This kind of revolution, due to the variations in the condition of the enemy and in the conditions of this alliance may be divided into a certain number of stages during its process, but no change will occur in its fundamental character which will be the same until the arrival of the socialist revolution.

This kind of revolution is a great blow to imperialism, and therefore is not permitted but opposed by the imperialists. On the other hand, it is permitted by socialism, and is assisted by the Socialist state and the international socialist proletariat.

Thus, this kind of revolution has [inexorably] become a part of the proletarian-socialist world revolution.

"China's revolution is a part of the world revolution." This correct thesis was proposed as early as 1924-27 during the period of China's Great Revolution. It was advanced by the Communists and was approved by all who participated in the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal struggle of the time. . . .

This "world revolution" is not the old world revolution of the bourgeoisie which has long become a matter of the past, but is the new world revolution, the socialist revolution. In like manner, the "part" means not a part of the old bourgeois revolution but a part of the new socialist revolution. This is an exceedingly great change, a change unprecedented in the world history and the history of China.

[1] Here in the same sentence, the same word, *chuan-cheng*, for "dictatorship," is translated in the Browder edition in the one case as "dictatorship" and in the other as "ruled" (by revolutionary classes), to disguise its character for American consumption. Throughout the subsequent text this doctoring of the text is consistently carried through, while the translator never fails to translate *chuan-cheng* as "dictatorship" when it refers to the Kuomintang or the "capitalist democracies." This Chinese word admits of no two interpretations.

It is basing themselves on the correct theory of Stalin that the Chinese Communists advanced this correct thesis. . . . [Two quotations from Stalin follow—omitted here.]

From this we know that there exist two kinds of revolutions. The first, belonging to the bourgeois or capitalism category, has become a matter of the past since the outbreak of the first imperialist world war in 1914, and especially since the October Revolution of 1917. From then on, the second kind of world revolution commenced, the proletarian or socialist world revolution, with the proletariat of the capitalist countries as its main force and the oppressed peoples of the colonies and semi-colonies as its allies. . . .

The significance of China's revolution is greatly magnified today, because it is happening at a time when the political and economic crises of capitalism have brought the world step by step toward the second imperialist war; when the Soviet Union has reached the transitional period from Socialism to Communism and has the ability to lead and to assist the proletariat, the oppressed peoples and all the revolutionary peoples of the world [to oppose the imperialist war and strike a blow at capitalist counter-revolution];[2] when the proletarian forces of the various capitalist countries are (*growing stronger and stronger*) [preparing to overthrow capitalism and establish a socialist society][3] . . . China's revolution is a magnificent part of the world revolution!

. . . China's revolution . . . is a magnificent part, a magnificent ally of it at the present. The first step or stage of this revolution is certainly not to, and certainly cannot, establish a capitalist society dictated by the bourgeoisie, but to establish a New Democracy (*ruled*[4] *by the alliance*) [under the joint dictatorship] of several revolutionary classes. After the accomplishment of this first stage, it will be developed into the second stage—to establish the socialist society of China.

This is the most fundamental characteristic of the present Chinese revolution . . . and its living, concrete content.

V. Politics of New Democracy

. . . The Democratic Republic of China which we are aiming to construct now can only be (*ruled by an alliance*) [a joint dictatorship]

[2] Browder's edition expurgates this reference to Russia's "assistance" to the world proletariat to oppose the "second imperialist war."

[3] Browder's edition expurgates this phrase and substitutes the words "growing stronger and stronger," which are not in the original.

[4] The translator of the Browder edition again renders the same Chinese word once as "dictated" and once as "ruled" to avoid the phrase "dictatorship of revolutionary classes." Yet in the entire English text, whenever the word "dictatorship" is used, the original word is still *chuan-cheng*, which shows the translator knows very well what that word means.

of all anti-imperialist and anti-feudal people. It is a Republic of New Democracy, or a Republic of the genuine, revolutionary San Min Chu I that includes Dr. Sun's three revolutionary policies.

This Republic of New Democracy is different on the one hand from the old Western-style capitalist republics (*that are ruled by*) [under the dictatorship of] capitalists and are already out-of-date. On the other hand, it is also different from the newest, Soviet-style socialist republic, (*that is ruled by*) [under the dictatorship of] the proletariat. [This kind of republic has already arisen and grown strong in the Soviet Union, and furthermore will yet be established in the different capitalist countries, and will undoubtedly become the type of government of all progressive countries through the Union of Nations and of political power.][5] Nevertheless, in a certain historical period, the Soviet-style republic cannot be fittingly practised in colonial and semi-colonial countries, the national policy of which therefore must be of a third type—that of the New Democracy. This is a national policy for a certain historical period, and is therefore transitional in character, but it is a form indispensable and unalterable.

[Hence, according to their social character, the forms of government of all the countries of the world fall fundamentally into three categories: (*a*) republics under the dictatorship of the capitalist class; (*b*) republics under the dictatorship of the proletariat, and (*c*) republics under the joint dictatorship of several revolutionary classes.

The first category comprises the countries of the old democracy. Today, after the outbreak of the second imperialist war, the breath of democracy has already disappeared from all capitalist countries. All have become, or are about to become, blood-smelling, military dictatorships of the capitalist classes. Certain countries under the joint dictatorship of the landlords and the capitalist classes can be grouped under this heading.][6]

The second form of republic is fermenting in the various capitalist countries, besides its realization in the Soviet Union. It will become (*the ruling form of the world*) [the form of world rule] in a certain period.

The third form is the transitional form in the revolutionary colonial and semi-colonial countries. . . .

. . . (*Bourgeois*) [Capitalist][7] elements are accustomed to conceal the truth about class status, and resort to the term "nation" to camouflage

[5] This sentence is entirely expurgated.

[6] This entire passage is garbled in the Browder translation. Two sentences, beginning "Today, after" are entirely expurgated.

[7] Browder's edition deliberately and consistently translates the word "capitalist" as "bourgeois," whenever the text has an anti-capitalist flavor.

the actuality of one-class dictatorship. Such concealment gives no benefit to the revolutionary people and therefore should be clearly exposed. The term "nation" can sometimes be used of course, but it does not include the traitors and the counter-revolutionary elements. It (the national structure) means a dictatorship of all the revolutionary people—and revolutionary classes over the traitors and counter-revolutionaries. (*Such is our country*) [such is the kind of country we want today.][8]

[In national structure, a joint dictatorship of several revolutionary classes and in form of government, democratic centralization][9]—this is the politics of New Democracy—the Republic of New Democracy, the republic of a united anti-Japanese front, the republic of New San Min Chu I. . . .

VI. Economy of New Democracy

Big banks, big industries and big business shall be owned by this republic. . . .

It will adopt certain measures to confiscate the land of big landlords and distribute it to the peasants who are without land or have too little of it, to realize Dr. Sun's slogan "Land to those who till it," and to liquidate the feudal relation in rural districts. . . .

. . . We can never let the few capitalists and landlords "manipulate the life of the people," nor can we construct a capitalist society of the European or American style. Whoever dares to act against this direction shall not be able to accomplish his work, and he himself shall find his head broken.

VII. Refutation of (*the Theory of Bourgeois*) [capitalist] Dictatorship

Can we go the road of a capitalist society (*ruled by the bourgeoisie?*) [under the dictatorship of the capitalist classes]?[10] No doubt this is the old path of the European and American capitalists. But the international and internal environments do not allow China to do so.

From the standpoint of international environment, such a way is a dead alley. [The present-day international environment, fundamentally speaking, is that of a struggle between capitalism and socialism, one in which capitalism is going down and socialism is growing up.][11] First, this way is not permitted by international capitalism or imperialist aggres-

[8] Browder's edition deliberately translates this simple, clear and important sentence as "Such is our country."

[9] Browder's version garbled.

[10] It is Mao Tse-tung's assumption throughout this book that western democracies are capitalist dictatorships.

[11] Sentence expur[illegible]

sion. The modern history of China is a history of imperialist opposition to China's independence and to China's development of her capitalism. Revolutions in China failed one after another, because imperialism strangled them, and numerous martyrs sacrificed their lives . . . this is a period of the last struggle of imperialism, which will soon pass away. "Imperialism is (*moribund*) capitalism [on the point of death]." But just because of that, the maintenance of imperialism has to rely more and more on colonies and semi-colonies, and surely it will not allow the colonies and semi-colonies to establish a (*society ruled by their own bourgeoisie.*) [capitalist society under the dictatorship of the capitalist classes.]

Secondly, such a way is not permitted by socialism. [In this world, all imperialists are our enemies.][12] We cannot be separated from the socialist state or from the aid of the international proletariat, if we wish to seek for independence. That is to say, we cannot separate ourselves from the assistance of the Soviet Union or from the victory of the anti-capitalist struggles of the proletariat of Japan, Great Britain, the United States, France and Germany. Their victories help us. Although we cannot say that victory in China must be preceded by the success of revolutions of the above countries, or at least in one or two of the above countries, it is doubtless that we can only win our victory with their assistance. This is especially true of the aid of the Soviet Union, an indispensable condition for the final victory of China's war of resistance. To refuse Soviet aid will surely bring about the failure of the revolution. Is this not clear in the lesson of China's anti-Soviet movement after 1927? Is it not a dream to expect that China can establish a (*bourgeois*) [capitalist] society (*ruled by her own bourgeoisie*) [under a capitalist dictatorship] after the victory of the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal struggles, in a period when the world is in the midst of wars and revolutions and when [capitalism is certainly doomed and][13] socialism is destined to prosper?

. . . a small Kemalist (*bourgeoisie-ruled*) [capitalist-dictated] Turkey had come into existence after the first world war and the Russian October Revolution; the same can never happen again after World War II and after the Soviet Union has accomplished her socialist reconstruction, especially (*when the*) [as she will not permit a].[14] "Turkey" (*in this case is one*) composed of 450,000,000 people. . . . [Besides, the Turkey of Kemal had in the end to fall into the lap of British and French impe-

[12] Deliberately expurgated in Browder's edition.
[13] Deliberately expurgated in Browder's edition.
[14] Browder's edition expurgates the words Russia "will not permit."

rialists, and day by day become a semi-colonial country, become a part of the imperialist counter-revolution.][15] In the international environment of the fourth and fifth decades of this twentieth century, the "heroes" of the colonies and semi-colonies have to stand either on the imperialist front and play a role in the world counter-revolution, or on the anti-imperialist front and play a role in the world revolution. They must choose either one of the two. There is not a third road.

VIII. Refutation of "Left" Doctrinairism

If it is impossible for us to go the road of capitalism with a (*bourgeois*) [capitalist] dictatorship would it be possible then for us to go the road of socialism with a proletarian dictatorship? No, it is just as impossible.

Without doubt, the present revolution is only the first step, and a second step—the step of socialism will be developed in the future. It is only when China arrives at that stage, that she can be called really felicitous . . . China's revolution must be divided into two steps, the first being that of New Democracy, the second that of socialism. Moreover, the period of the first step is by no means a short one. It is not a matter that can be achieved overnight. We are not Utopians. We cannot isolate ourselves from the actual conditions right before our eyes.

But certain persons who do not seem to be ill-minded are also fascinated with the theory of "a single revolution" and lend themselves to the subjective thought of "accomplishing both the political revolution and the social revolution by one stroke." They do not understand that a revolution is divided into stages. We can proceed from one revolution to another revolution, but cannot "accomplish everything by one stroke." Their erroneous point of view inevitably confuses the revolutionary steps, decreases effort in realizing the present task, and is therefore very harmful. That the first one is the prerequisite of the second, and that one must follow the other closely, not permitting a (*bourgeois*) [capitalist] dictatorship to be inserted between them, that is correct, and is the Marxist theory of revolutionary development. On the contrary, . . . such an empty idea—the so-called "to accomplish all by one stroke policy"—should not be adopted by real revolutionaries.

IX. Refutation of the (*Obstinate*) [Reactionary] Elements

The (*obstinate*) [reactionary] elements of the bourgeoisie then come

[15] Browderized or expurgated for political purposes.

forward and say: "Well, since you Communists have put aside the social system of socialism for a later stage, and since you have declared: 'San Min Chu I is a necessity today, and our party is willing to struggle for its thorough realization,' why then don't you pack up your Communism for a while?" This argument, under the theme of "one doctrine," has recently been magnified into a mad shout. . . . It may also be described as lack of common sense if we wish to be polite.

Communism is the proletarian system of thought, and is also a new kind of social system. It is different from any other ideological system or social system in that it is the most complete, the most progressive, the most revolutionary, and the most rational system in human history. The feudal ideology and social system have now become fit for the museum of historical relics; (*and so has*) a part of the capitalist (*system*) [ideology and social system has already entered historical museums] (*in the U.S.S.R.*). And the remaining part of it is "like a setting sun, breathing its final breaths," and "not knowing in the morning whether it can still survive in the evening." [It is soon to enter historical museums.] It is only the Communist ideology and social system that grow and spread in the world, with a mighty thundering force that can level mountains and overturn seas, and maintain their flowering youth. . . . The world now depends on Communism (*for its*) [as its star of] salvation, and so does China.

Everybody knows that regarding the social system and the program for action, the Communist Party has a present program and a future program, or, the minimum program and the maximum program. At present, it is New Democracy, in the future, it is socialism—these are two organic parts, guided by the whole Communist system of thought. Is it not absurd to demand the "packing up" of Communism, simply because the minimum program of the Communist Party is fundamentally coincident with the political principle of San Min Chu I? . . .

It is illogical too to bring forth the theory of "one doctrine." So long as different classes exist in a society, different doctrines will exist according to the number of the existent classes, and even within one class, different cliques may have different doctrines of their own. . . . To tell you frankly, it is useless to urge us to "pack up." It is much better to urge us to make a contest. If there is somebody who beats us in the race, we shall admit that it is our fate. If not, you had better "pack up" your anti-democratic, "one principle" style as early as possible.

There are similar parts and dissimilar parts in San Min Chu I and Communism.

First, the similar part: This is the fundamental political program of the two doctrines in the stage of bourgeois-democratic revolution. . . .

Secondly, the dissimilar parts: (1) First is the difference in certain points of the program during the stage of democratic revolution. . . . (2) Second is the difference regarding the two stages. Besides the stage of democratic revolution, there is also a stage of socialist revolution in Communism, therefore, besides the minimum program there is also a maximum program, i.e. the program for the realization of the socialist system. San Min Chu I has only the stage of democratic revolution but not the stage of socialist revolution; therefore, it has only the minimum program but not the maximum program for the construction of the socialist system. (3) Third is the difference in the conception of universe. The Communist cosmic philosophy is dialectic materialism and historic materialism, while that of the San Min Chu I is "Wei-sheng-ism" or the life interpretation of history. The two are contrary to each other. (4) Fourth is the difference of thoroughness in the execution of the revolution. . . .

X. The Old and the New San Min Chu I

The obstinate elements of the (*bourgeoisie*) [capitalists] do not comprehend the changes in history. Their level of knowledge is so low that it can practically be described as "below zero." They know neither the difference between San Min Chu I and Communism, nor the difference between the old San Min Chu I and the New San Min Chu I. . . .

First, the revolutionary San Min Chu I, the New San Min Chu I or the genuine San Min Chu I, must be one that allies itself with the Soviet Union. [The facts of today are very clear. If we do not adopt the policy of allying ourselves with the Soviet Union, if we do not ally ourselves with a socialist state, then we have to adopt a pro-imperialist policy, have to ally ourselves with imperialist powers. Do we not see that the same thing took place after 1927? In the first two years of the war, before the outbreak of the imperialist war, we could still utilize the contradictions between Japan and countries like England and the United States. After the outbreak of the imperialist war, such contradictions have already diminished, although they have not disappeared, and if we made a mistake in exploiting them, Great Britain and the United States might ask us to join up against the Soviet Union. If we go along with them, we shall at once

line up ourselves in the counter-revolutionary camps of the imperialist powers, and our national independence will be over. The contest between the socialist Soviet Union and imperialist England and America is being sharpened step by step. If China does not stand on one side, she will have to stand on the other. Does anyone think of remaining neutral? That will be sheer fantasy. The whole world is going to be embroiled in the war of the two camps. In the world hereafter, "neutrality" will be merely a term to deceive people. Besides,][16] If we forsake the policy of allying with the Soviet Union and co-operate with imperialism instead, then the word "revolution" may be cancelled, and San Min Chu I will become a reactionary doctrine. There is no neutral San Min Chu I, but a revolutionary or a counter-revolutionary one. If you act according to what was once said by Wang Ching-wei—"to struggle against offensives from two sides"—, and try to have a San Min Chu I that opposes Communism as well as imperialism, it is brave indeed! But what is pitiful is that even the inventor of this strategy, the traitor Wang Ching-wei, has forsaken (or packed up) this kind of San Min Chu I and changed to adopt one that co-operates with imperialism. [You may say, "There is a difference between eastern and western imperialists. He allies himself with the eastern imperialists, but I will do the opposite, I will ally myself with the sons-of-bitches,[17] the western imperialists." That sounds indeed brave! Unfortunately, the western imperialists will be anti-Soviet and anti-Communist. If you join them, they will ask you to strike northward. Then good-bye to your revolution.] Thus, the revolutionary San Min Chu I, the New San Min Chu I or the genuine San Min Chu I, has to be one allying itself with the Soviet Union, and can never be one that allies with the imperialists to oppose the Soviet Union.

Secondly, the revolutionary San Min Chu I, the New San Min Chu I or the genuine San Min Chu I must be one that co-operates with Communism. If you do not co-operate with Communism, you cannot help opposing it, and anti-Communism is the very policy of the Japanese imperialists and Wang Ching-wei. . . . You may argue: "I am not going to follow Japan. [I'll follow other countries."][18] It is ridiculous just the same. No matter whom you are going to follow, so long as you are anti-Communistic, you are traitors, because by doing so you cannot resist the

[16] Whole passage in square brackets expurgated in Browder's edition.
[17] *Tama*, Chinese obscenity, with reference to "mothers" and a four-letter English word understood.
[18] Expurgated. Browder wishes to conceal the fact that the author is opposed to China following England and America.

Japanese any more. "Why can't I resist the Japanese independently?" No, that is talking in a dream. How can the colonial or semi-colonial "heroes" carry on such great piece of counter-revolutionary work without relying on the forces of imperialism? . . . Whoever prepares to oppose the Communists has to prepare to be crushed. If they have not so prepared, it is better for them to withdraw their hands before it is too late. This is the sincere advice I give to the anti-Communist heroes. Upon this, it is very, very clear that San Min Chu I today must be one that co-operates with the Communists, or it will crumble. This is a question of life and death to the San Min Chu I. It will exist when co-operating with Communism, and expire when fighting against it. Who can prove that this is not true?

Thirdly, the revolutionary San Min Chu I, the New San Min Chu I or the genuine San Min Chu I must be the one that adopts (*the policy of protecting the interests of peasants and workers.*) [the peasant and labor policy.] . . . Stalin said: "The question of colonies and semi-colonies is in essence the question of the peasantry." . . . the New San Min Chu I or the genuine San Min Chu I is in essence the (*revolutionary principle of the peasantry*) [the principle of peasant revolution]; the content of popular culture is in essence the elevation of culture among the peasantry; [the war against Japan in its essence is the peasants' war;][19] . . . We say "in essence" which somewhat means "fundamentally," because we do not neglect other elements. Stalin has explained this point himself. . . .

From this we (*can*) know that apart from the three revolutionary policies of allying ourselves with the Soviet Union, co-operating with the Communists, and protecting and assisting the peasants and the workers, no San Min Chu I can have a promising future. . . .

This San Min Chu I with the three revolutionary policies, this revolutionary San Min Chu I or New San Min Chu I or genuine San Min Chu I, is the San Min Chu I of New Democracy—the development of the old San Min Chu I, the great achievement of Dr. Sun, and the product of a period when China's revolution is considered a part of the socialist world revolution. It is only this kind of San Min Chu I that the Communists recognize as "China's necessity today," and declare themselves "willing to struggle for its thorough realization." It is only this kind of San Min Chu I that is fundamentally coincident with the minimum program of the Communists or the Communist political program for the stage of democracy.

[19] Expurgated.

. . . . Hence, the San Min Chu I before the re-organization of the Kuomintang in 1924 is one that belongs to the old category, one that is already out-of-date. If it is not developed into the New San Min Chu I, the Kuomintang will not be able to go forward any further. The wise Dr. Sun saw this point, revised his doctrine through the assistance of Lenin and the Chinese Communist Party. . . .

If there is such San Min Chu I which opposes the Soviet Union, the Communists and the peasants and the workers, it is a reactionary San Min Chu I. It not only has nothing in common with the minimum program of the Communists, but is its enemy. No compromise of the two can be considered. This also the disciples of San Min Chu I should remember.

XI. The Culture of New Democracy

. . . In China, there is imperialist culture, which is the reflection of the control or the partial control of the imperialist politics and economy over China. This kind of culture, besides being advocated by the cultural organizations run directly by the imperialists in China, is also advocated by some shameless people. All cultures with "slave ideology" belong to this group. There is also semi-feudal culture in China, which reflects the semi-feudal politics and economy of the country. Those who advocate the worship of Confucius, the study of ancient classics, the practice of old rules of propriety and old thoughts, and the opposition of new culture and new thoughts, are the representatives of this kind of culture. The imperialist and the semi-feudal cultures are intimate friends. They have formed an alliance of the reactionary cultures to oppose the new culture, and served the benefits of the imperialists and the feudal class, and they should therefore be unquestionably overthrown. Without the overthrow of these reactionary cultures, new culture can never be established. One cannot be established or extended if the other is not stopped or crushed. The struggle between the two is a struggle of life and death.

. . . The old is composed of two parts—the semi-feudal politics, economy and culture of China herself, and imperialist politics, economy and culture—the latter being the controller of the alliance. They are all rotten and should be destroyed completely. The struggle between the new and the old in China's society is the struggle between the new forces of the people (the various revolutionary classes) and the old forces of the imperialists and the feudal classes. It is a struggle of revolution and counter-revolution.

XII. The Historical Characteristics of China's Cultural Revolution

In the sphere of cultural ideology, two historical periods may be divided—that before and that after the May 4th Movement of 1919.

Before the May 4th Movement, the struggle on China's cultural front was a struggle between the new culture of the bourgeoisie and the old culture of the feudal class. . . . The so-called schools, new learning and Western learning of that time, were fundamentally the natural and social science of the (*bourgeoisie*) [capitalists] (we say "fundamentally" here, because there were still remnant poisons of feudalism in them). Social sciences represented by the works introduced by Yen Fu—such as Darwin's theory of evolution, Adam Smith's classical economics, Mill's formal logic, the French enlightener Montesquieu's theory of society—plus the natural sciences of that time, were the ruling thought of the so-called new learning before the May 4th Movement. . . . However, because of the weakness of the Chinese bourgeoisie, and the fact that the world has already reached the stage of imperialism, this bourgeois thought of China could not stand for long, and was soon defeated by the reactionary alliance of the slave thought of imperialism and the antiquity-restoring thoughts of feudalism. . . . In the period of imperialism, the culture of the old bourgeois-democratic revolution has become corrupt and powerless. Its failure is inevitable.

The May 4th Movement brought about a new phase. After that movement, there was produced in China a new cultural recruit force, the cultural thought of Communism led by the Chinese Communists, i.e. the Communist theory of social revolution and the Communist conception of the world. . . . Because of the appearance of the new political force . . . the new cultural force too, with its new attire and new arms and with the aid of all possible allies, displayed its power and launched a brave attack on the imperialist and feudal cultures. This new force, in spite of the fact that it has not had sufficient time to establish its basis in the sphere of natural sciences, and thus has to let such sciences be controlled temporarily by (*bourgeois cosmism*) [capitalist weltanshauung] has aroused a great revolution in the sphere of social sciences— . . . In the sphere of social sciences, no matter whether in philosophy, economics, politics, military science, history, literature or arts (again in drama, cinema, music, sculpture or painting), there have been colossal developments. . . . The mightiness of its power is matchless, and the

extent of its mobilization has surpassed that of any period in Chinese history.

Before the May 4th Movement, the new culture of China was one possessing the character of the old democracy, and was a part of the capitalist cultural revolution of the world bourgeoisie. After that, it has become one possessing the character of new democracy, and is a part of the socialist cultural revolution of the world proletariat.

. . . After the May 4th Movement the bourgeois cultural thought became even more backward than bourgeois politics, and it is no more the leader of the cultural movement . . . while the leadership of the alliance falls on the proletarian cultural thought. This is a fact as solid as iron. Nobody can deny it.

What we call the culture of the New Democracy . . . can only be led by the cultural thought of the proletariat, i.e. the thought of Communism, and cannot be led by that of any other class. In a word, the culture of New Democracy is "the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal culture of the masses and the people that is led by the proletariat."

XIII. The Four Periods

A cultural revolution ideologically reflects and serves the political and economic revolution. . . .

The history of the united front of the cultural revolution in these twenty years can be divided into four periods—the first period from 1919 to 1921, the second from 1921 to 1927, the third from 1927 to 1936, and the fourth from 1937 up to the present.

The first period was the period from the May 4th Movement of 1919 to the inauguration of the Chinese Communist Party in 1921. . . .

The May 4th Movement was an anti-imperialist as well as an anti-feudal movement. . . . The reason why the May 4th Movement possessed this characteristic is that the capitalist economy of China had made new steps in its development at that time, and that the then revolutionary intelligentsia of China had personally witnessed the disintegration of the three big imperialist countries—Russia, Germany and Austria, the wounding of two of them, Britain and France, the construction of the socialist state by the Russian proletariat, and Germany, Austria-Hungary and Italy in the grips of proletarian revolutions. . . . Thus, the May 4th Movement broke out at the call of the world revolution, of the Russian Revolution and Lenin, and was a part of the proletarian revolution of that time. Although we did not have a Communist Party during the May 4th Move-

ment, many intellectuals did possess primary Communist thoughts and approved the Russian Revolution. . . .

The second period had as its ensigns the inauguration of the Chinese Communist Party, the May 30th Movement of 1925 and the Northern Expedition. . . .

In this period, the revolutionary San Min Chu I became the political basis of Kuomintang-Communist co-operation. . . . The two doctrines were consolidated into a united front. . . .

The third period was the new revolutionary period between 1927 and 1936. . . . The bourgeoisie deserted their former ally to join the camp of the counter-revolutionary imperialist and feudal forces. If there had been three classes inside the camp of the revolutionaries before, only two of them, the proletariat and the petit-bourgeoisie (which includes the peasantry, the revolutionary intelligentsia and other petit-bourgeois elements), were left now.

The struggle of this period was between the firm persistence of the popular, anti-imperialist, anti-feudal New Democracy or New San Min Chu I on the side of the revolutionaries, and the absolutism of the Chinese landlord-bourgeoisie alliance under imperialist direction on the side of the counter-revolutionaries. . . .

The fourth period is the period of the present anti-Japanese war of resistance.

. . . The people of the whole nation have now in their minds the following question: "What will become the future of this struggle?" . . . The rampancy of the dark forces, national and international has caused our national calamity. This rampancy not only indicates that the dark forces are still powerful, but also symbolizes the last desperate struggle of the dark forces and the approaching victory of the people. This is true of the Orient as well as of the whole world.

XIV. (*Partial Views*) [Tendencies] Concerning the Question of the Character of Cultural Movement

. . . The present new culture of China naturally becomes a part of the proletarian-socialist culture of the world, and is its great ally. . . . The present new culture of China also cannot be separated from the cultural thought of the Chinese proletariat, i.e. the leadership of Communism. . . .

Doubtlessly, we should now expand the propaganda of Communist thought and intensify the study of Marx-Leninism, without which we will

not only be unable to lead China's revolution to the higher step of socialism, but also be incapable of directing and winning the victory of the present democratic revolution.

From this, we (*can*) know, the content of China's New Culture at the present stage is not the (*bourgeois*) [capitalist] cultural absolutism nor proletarian socialism. It is the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal New Democracy or New San Min Chu I of the Chinese people, led by the cultural thought of the proletariat.

XV. A National, Scientific and Popular Culture

The culture of New Democracy is scientific in character. . . . In this point, the scientific thought of the Chinese proletariat may form an anti-imperialist, anti-feudal, and anti-superstition united front with the materialism and natural sciences of the bourgeoisie that are still progressive in character, but it can never unite with the reactionary idealism. Chinese Communists may form an anti-imperialist united front politically with certain idealists and disciples of religion but can never approve their idealism or religious teachings.

APPENDIX

Interesting passages from *Tang ti Chien Sheh,* Chinese Communist Handbook on Party Organization for party members (1938).

Chapter I, Section I (On Party Membership)

"According to the constitution of the Chinese Communist Party, all who recognize the constitution and Rules and Program of the Communist International and the Chinese Communist Party, join and actively work in one of the party organizations, obey all the decisions of the Communist International and the (Chinese) Central Committee, and pay the membership dues may become party members." (Par. 2.)

"The Chinese Communist Party does not at present have its own maximum program. What it carries out are the program of the Communist International and its own minimum program." (Par. 3.)

"The Communist International more than once directed us to watch over and adjust systematically and constantly the constituent elements of party membership." (Par. 6.)

Chapter II, Section I (On Party Organization)

"The political line of Leninism and the method of organization of Leninism are the foundation of the Communist Party." (Par. 2.)

Chapter II, Section VI (On the Central Committee)

"The Central Committee members and reserve members are elected by the National Congress. But when conditions do not permit the holding of a National Congress, the Central Committee members and reserve members may be named and their replacements made under the official approval of the Communist International." (Par. 1.)

"The Central leadership of the Party is directly responsible to the National Congress and the Communist International. The Chinese Communist Party was born with the help of the Communist International; it grew up under the guidance of the Communist International; and the Chinese Revolution developed under the guidance of the Chinese International. The Chinese Communist Party and its Central Committee (with the exception of the two short periods under Chen Tu-hsiu-ism and Li Li-

san's party line[20] have been loyal to the guidance of the Communist International. The Central Committee in the periods under Chen Tu-hsiuism and Li Li-san's party line did not obey the Communist International, thereby bringing about the failure and great setback of the Revolution in 1930. To carry out the international line and be loyal to the Central Committee of the Communist International is to guarantee the success of the Chinese Revolution." (Par. 3.)

[20] The late Chen Tu-hsiu was a Trotzkyist, opposed to Stalinist Yenan. Li Li-san was for immediate establishment of a dictatorship of the proletariat and opposed to the "two stages" of the China Revolution ordered by the Sixth Congress of the Communist International.